



Making San Francisco Bay Better

September 8, 2011

Mark and Maureen Sanders
16075 Skyline Boulevard
Woodside, California 94062

SUBJECT: BCDC Permit No. 2002.002.04; Conditional Approval of Construction Details, Utilities, Lighting, Signing, Striping and Dimensioning Plans for Westpoint Harbor and Approval of Architectural Plans for the Westpoint Harbor Master Office; Landscape Feedback from September 1, 2011 Site Visit

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Sanders:

Thank you for our meeting and site visit last week on September 1, 2011 at Westpoint Harbor with you, Michael Smiley, Valerie Conant, Tom Sinclair and myself. I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and view the site. It was valuable to discuss together with Michael Smiley and Valerie Conant the landscape plans which they will prepare to meet your permit requirements.

Following my site visit, I would like to provide conditional approval as well as approval for plans which you have already submitted to our office. I would also like to take the opportunity to relay my initial thoughts on the existing landscaping that will assist you in developing the landscape plans for our review.

My conditional plan approval is for the twenty-six sheets prepared by Bohley Consulting, which are mostly dated March 12, 2007 and are labeled as Construction Details, Utilities, Lighting, Signing, Striping and Dimensioning Plans. These materials were received in our office on June 27, 2011 and have been reviewed pursuant to the authorization and requirements of BCDC Permit No. 2002.002.04.

After careful review of the above-mentioned plans, I have determined that they are mostly consistent with the authorization and requirements of the BCDC permit and are, therefore, **conditionally approved**.

The plans are approved contingent upon the following:

1. **Sheet 2 – Path Detail.** Detail 1 on Sheet 2 shows a cross section of the Bay Trail Path, which indicates that the finished path material would be "4-inch CL2AB (recycled)." As you know, the path was instead finished with decomposed granite, which we prefer and believe is appropriate. Please either revise this detail or provide a new as-built detail to supersede this one that depicts how the path was actually constructed.

2. **Sheet 8 – Grading Plan.** This drawing does not show a path parallel to the shoreline along the southern side of the peninsula as shown on Exhibit A, the Public Access Plan, of your permit. As we discussed, the permit currently depicts a triangular configuration of paths at this location and, as such, either your drawings need to be revised to follow what is required under the current permit or you may request an amendment to the permit to change this path configuration such as keeping the southern leg of the triangle and omitting the north-south leg as we discussed. It is important to us that there be a path parallel to the southern shoreline as required by your permit and shown on Exhibit A.
3. **Sheets 15-18 – Lighting, Signing, Striping and Dimensioning Plans.** The striping and dimensioning shown on these plans all correspond to the authorization under the permit. The plans, however, do not depict lighting for the public access areas nor do they show public access signs. Please provide plans to show lighting within the public access areas and also provide plans to show the required public access signs which should include the following as specified in the permit:
 - a. (15) signed public parking spaces for vehicle and boat trailer parking;
 - b. (12) signs for public parking spaces; and
 - c. (15) BCDC public access signs and also Bay Trail signs at the beginning of each path on the site.
4. **Sheet 20 – Dimensioning Plan.** As noted in Item 2 above, the path parallel to the shoreline along the southern side of the peninsula is not shown on this drawing. Once again, either the drawing should be changed to follow the permit requirements or you need to request a permit amendment and revise the drawings as needed.

I have also reviewed the Architectural Plans prepared by b design studio/solution that include fifteen sheets and are dated August 18, 2008. These materials were received in our office on June 27, 2011 and have been reviewed pursuant to the authorization and requirements of BCDC Permit No. 2002.002.04. After careful review of these plans, I have determined that they are consistent with the authorization and requirements of the BCDC permit and are, therefore, **approved**.

I would also like to take the opportunity to provide some initial feedback and thoughts I have regarding the existing landscape.

1. **Decomposed Granite Path.** As we discussed, decomposed granite is an appropriate paving material for the public access paths and also what the DRB preferred, although I am concerned about the stability of the path as it is installed. The surface appears to be inadequately compacted as the top is sloughing a bit in areas. We want to make sure that the path will hold up well over time and also want the path to be accessible to all users including those with physical disabilities. Upon obtaining plan approval for the pathway, please ensure that the path is adequately stabilized to accommodate these concerns.
2. **Tree Placement and Selection.** As we talked about in the field, the drawings prepared for the Design Review Board (Exhibit 8 for the August 7, 2006 DRB meeting) did not show any trees directly adjacent to the shoreline nor did they indicate any trees in the triangular point area adjacent to Pacific Shores. You have planted a number of trees in a line along the shoreline and along the perimeter of the point.

2. **Sheet 8 – Grading Plan.** This drawing does not show a path parallel to the shoreline along the southern side of the peninsula as shown on Exhibit A, the Public Access Plan, of your permit. As we discussed, the permit currently depicts a triangular configuration of paths at this location and, as such, either your drawings need to be revised to follow what is required under the current permit or you may request an amendment to the permit to change this path configuration such as keeping the southern leg of the triangle and omitting the north-south leg as we discussed. It is important to us that there be a path parallel to the southern shoreline as required by your permit and shown on Exhibit A.
3. **Sheets 15-18 – Lighting, Signing, Striping and Dimensioning Plans.** The striping and dimensioning shown on these plans all correspond to the authorization under the permit. The plans, however, do not depict lighting for the public access areas nor do they show public access signs. Please provide plans to show lighting within the public access areas and also provide plans to show the required public access signs which should include the following as specified in the permit:
 - a. (15) signed public parking spaces for vehicle and boat trailer parking;
 - b. (12) signs for public parking spaces; and
 - c. (15) BCDC public access signs and also Bay Trail signs at the beginning of each path on the site.
4. **Sheet 20 – Dimensioning Plan.** As noted in Item 2 above, the path parallel to the shoreline along the southern side of the peninsula is not shown on this drawing. Once again, either the drawing should be changed to follow the permit requirements or you need to request a permit amendment and revise the drawings as needed.

I have also reviewed the Architectural Plans prepared by b design studio/solution that include fifteen sheets and are dated August 18, 2008. These materials were received in our office on June 27, 2011 and have been reviewed pursuant to the authorization and requirements of BCDC Permit No. 2002.002.04. After careful review of these plans, I have determined that they are consistent with the authorization and requirements of the BCDC permit and are, therefore, **approved**.

I would also like to take the opportunity to provide some initial feedback and thoughts I have regarding the existing landscape.

1. **Decomposed Granite Path.** As we discussed, decomposed granite is an appropriate paving material for the public access paths and also what the DRB preferred, although I am concerned about the stability of the path as it is installed. The surface appears to be inadequately compacted as the top is sloughing a bit in areas. We want to make sure that the path will hold up well over time and also want the path to be accessible to all users including those with physical disabilities. Upon obtaining plan approval for the pathway, please ensure that the path is adequately stabilized to accommodate these concerns.
2. **Tree Placement and Selection.** As we talked about in the field, the drawings prepared for the Design Review Board (Exhibit 8 for the August 7, 2006 DRB meeting) did not show any trees directly adjacent to the shoreline nor did they indicate any trees in the triangular point area adjacent to Pacific Shores. You have planted a number of trees in a line along the shoreline and along the perimeter of the point.

The trees were held back from the shoreline in the DRB landscape plans in order to maintain a visual openness to the water from the public access paths. The trees were also held back from the point due to concern for raptors that might prey upon wildlife in the refuge across the slough.

You have planted Monterey Cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*) and Cajeput (*Melaleuca quinquenervia*) trees around the site and these tree choices were on the DRB plan, although not in the locations where you planted them. You have also planted a number of Weeping Willow (*Salix babylonica*) and Brisbane Box (*Tristania conferta*), although these tree types were not included on the DRB plan nor were there trees shown in the locations where these were planted.

Although the Cypress and Cajeput trees would not naturally occur within this landscape, they have a more open nature and their aesthetic blends well within this environment. The Weeping Willow and Brisbane Box trees fit less well in this setting. Their vegetation is bulkier and will block wind as you desire, but will also block views.

There may be a way we can work with some of these trees by clustering like species and moving them away from the shoreline. Perhaps they could be planted in massings within your future building sites to provide the wind protection you desire for the marina while at the same time allowing open water views for public access users. The future buildings could then take the trees' place and serve as the wind protection features later.

In short, please provide plans that address these comments and be prepared to revise the as-built and unauthorized landscaping thereafter to match the soon-to-be approved plans.

3. **Seashore Paspalum.** At the end of our site visit, we walked by a stand of golden grass along the shoreline near the Harbor Master Office that you referred to as "Seashore Paspalum." You explained that you had planted it by seed last year to test it out. It is a beautiful grass and I think the aesthetic fits very well with the landscape although I am concerned that it could potentially be invasive to the refuge across the slough on Greco Island. I will try to find out some more information regarding this grass before you use any more of it upon the site. Should we determine that Seashore Paspalum is in fact invasive and poses a threat to the Greco Island and other areas of the marsh, you will need to remove the plants from the property, including all root and rhizome structures. Of course, this would occur pursuant to plan approval that would replace the existing grass with a noninvasive species, should we conclude that we cannot approve the use of this species.
4. **Plant Choices.** The DRB specifically stated that your landscape should not match the Pacific Shores landscape. You shared that the City of Redwood City on the other hand wanted your landscape palette to match Pacific Shores. As we discussed on the site, I think some plants that have proven to do well at Pacific Shores could be incorporated into your landscape while primarily using more native choices and following a more natural, less-water intensive landscape aesthetic as was shown in the DRB plans.

Mark and Maureen Sanders
September 8, 2011
Page 4

If you would like to discuss any of this feedback, please do call me and we can talk about it by phone. Once again, thank you for the site visit. The marina is really a beautiful setting with stunning views and it was wonderful to come experience it. I believe that the public access area and the landscape surrounding it will be a treasured place for the public to come and experience. I look forward to working with you and BMS Design Group further regarding the final public access plans. As you know the final public access plans should include, screening between the marina and adjacent salt ponds, landscaping, irrigation, lighting, signage and site furniture within the public access areas. If you or BMS Design Group would like to coordinate with me during the course of developing these drawings, I am happy to review in-progress drawings, etc. to make the more process efficient. Please remember that this letter does not supersede the contents of your permit and Tom Sinclair's letter dated September 1, 2011 but is rather intended to further assist you in fulfilling the outstanding requirements as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me by phone at (415) 352-3643 or by email at ellenm@bcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst

EM/gg

cc: Michael Smiley, BMS Design Group

Mark and Maureen Sanders
September 8, 2011
Page 4

If you would like to discuss any of this feedback, please do call me and we can talk about it by phone. Once again, thank you for the site visit. The marina is really a beautiful setting with stunning views and it was wonderful to come experience it. I believe that the public access area and the landscape surrounding it will be a treasured place for the public to come and experience. I look forward to working with you and BMS Design Group further regarding the final public access plans. As you know the final public access plans should include, screening between the marina and adjacent salt ponds, landscaping, irrigation, lighting, signage and site furniture within the public access areas. If you or BMS Design Group would like to coordinate with me during the course of developing these drawings, I am happy to review in-progress drawings, etc. to make the more process efficient. Please remember that this letter does not supersede the contents of your permit and Tom Sinclair's letter dated September 1, 2011 but is rather intended to further assist you in fulfilling the outstanding requirements as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me by phone at (415) 352-3643 or by email at ellenm@bcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst

EM/gg

cc: Michael Smiley, BMS Design Group